



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

In the common speech the accusative is even used on occasion for the nominative.

The second volume of the work is to contain numerous selections of Greek authors. A prospectus of these is given, beginning with the Iliad and Odyssey, to be accompanied by modern Greek translations, and coming down through the classics, the New Testament, Lucian, etc., to the eighteenth century.

F. G. ALLINSON.

Das lateinische participium futuri passivi in seiner Bedeutung und syntaktischen Verwendung. Grammatische Studie von Dr. JOSEPH WEISWEILER. 146 pp. 8vo. Paderborn, 1890.

Dr. Weisweiler being a teacher in the gymnasia, and being dissatisfied with the treatment of the so-called gerunds and gerundives in the school grammars as well as elsewhere, has, in the book before us, set out to show the insufficiency and incorrectness of all previous theories on this subject, and to elaborate one of his own. He desires to prove that the verbal adjective in *-ndo* denotes primarily an action that is to be accomplished ("eine zu vollziehende Handlung"), and that this form is distinctly passive in its origin and meaning. In his opinion the fundamental error of all recent grammarians from Weissenborn down has lain in their attempt to proceed in the discussion of this form from a 'substantive gerund,' and to develop all actual usages from that beginning. He finds fault with the etymologists because etymology has led them to assign to this form an original active or neuter force, whereas, he asserts, no form of the Latin passive shows more distinctly its passive signification. He stoutly maintains that the way to arrive at the real signification of the verbal in *-ndo* is not to resort to comparative grammar, but to a careful study and comparison of the actual uses of the form in the literature of the language itself.

The first chapter is devoted to a consideration of the names applied to the participle in *-ndus* in its various uses. The term which had always been employed—*participium futuri passivi*—until recent scholars asserted its incorrectness, Weisweiler defends, not because it corresponds exactly to the genius of the Latin language, but because analogy and the system of the Latin conjugation demand a future passive participle, and because the term is just as appropriate to this form as present and future active participle to the forms in *-ns* and *-turus*, and perfect participle to that in *-tus*. In discussing the terms gerund and gerundive, our author combats the view advanced by Weissenborn that the former was only another expression for active, and to our mind successfully. His conclusion is that the term gerund, equivalent to *gerundi modus*, could have meant to the Latin grammarians nothing else than 'Verbalform der Ausführung,' and that they used *gerundia* and *gerundiva* as synonymous with the forms of *modus gerundi*. They had no singular *gerundivum* in the sense of *modus gerundi*, but considered the plurals *gerundia* and *gerundiva* as equivalents. Erroneous ideas concerning the relations of these two words, largely due to Pott, have distorted the real situation. These false ideas are based, apparently, on the supposed derivation of *gerundivum* from *gerundium*, which is impossible, as the proper derivative would be *gerundiale*, and this error has brought with it another, that the gerundive is really a further devel-

opment of the gerund, whereas this latter term designates only a special use of the participle in *-ndus*.

Another chapter has to do with the etymology of the suffix of this participle, and we are cautioned against sacrificing everything on the shrine of comparative grammar, for the meaning of the future passive participle and its syntax lie ready before us in the very earliest remains of the literature, and so clearly that they cannot be obscured by the allied forms of other languages. *Laudandus* has always had a sure and recognized meaning, and how can its syntax be helped by an etymology that either takes away its original meaning and puts in its place an unqualified neuter force; or asserts that the original meaning was exactly the opposite of that which we find it to be in actual use; or artificially separates the gerund and gerundive, caring nothing for the close union existing between them? And all this when the etymology is phonetically wholly uncertain! To-day it can be said, as Tobler said in 1867, in all these etymologies, the same syntactical difficulty remains, namely, the uniting of the active meaning of adjectives in *-undus* with the passive meaning of the gerundive-participle, and of this with the substantive neuter meaning of the proper infinitival gerund. Weisweiler examines the various etymologies at some length, and rejects them on one ground or another, and contents himself with Döhring's standpoint, assuming the suffix *-ndo* as a finished formation—'nec scire fas est omnia'—and finding this a sufficient basis for his syntactical investigations.

As regards the 'time-character' of participles in *-ndus* and *-bundus*, our author thinks that the gerundive suffix *-ndo* is to be considered, so far as form goes, a passive correlative of the act. part. suffix *-nt*, as is shown by the similar way in which both are applied to the stem. *Amans* corresponds to *amandus*, as *monens* to *monendus*. The correspondence between *amant* and the participial stem *amant-*, between *monent* and *monent-*, cannot be wholly accidental, and so in the passive *amandus*, *monendus* stand related to *amantur*, *monentur*. There are difficulties, however, connected with consonantal and *i*-stems which must be explained. While in the passive *leguntur*, *audiuntur* correspond exactly with *legundus*, *audiundus*, in the active we find beside *legunt* and *audiunt* not *legunt-*, *audiunt-*, but *legent-*, *audient-*, and in the passive another common form in *-iendus*, *-endus*. In the active Weisweiler regards *-ent* as the regular ending, and supposes that *-unt* was introduced through analogy with the 3d pers. plur. of verbs like *sunt* and *eunt* which had assumed the *u*-form for other reasons, and also because of the necessity that gradually arose of differentiating this ending from that of the optative-subjunctive and future. Thus *faciens* beside *faciunt* can be explained. For the existence of the double forms *capiendus*, *capiundus* beside *capiuntur*, no phonetic reason can be assigned, as a change from *u* to *e* in this place cannot be made. The occurrence of the two forms must be explained by the hypothesis that they come from different originals. *Legundus* stands in the same relation to *leguntur* as *legendus* to *legentur*. The former must have been originally a proper present participle, which character is still retained in some verbal forms like *oriundus*, *labundus*; the latter appears to have been a real future^c participle, formed at a time when the old subjunctive began to assume the character of an independent future tense. Support for this view is drawn from the analogy of the participial forms

in *-bundus*. These belong, as regards form, immediately to the passive-middle future in *-bor*, which was originally only a strengthened present, and we can consider *legendus*, *audiendus* beside *legentur*, *audientur*, and *populabundus* beside *populabuntur*, as, morphologically, future participles, of which the latter belonged to a time before the present in *-bo*, *-bor*, had yet assumed a future meaning, and the latter to a time when the subjunctive in *em (am) es* had already begun to assume a peculiar future sense, as opposed to the later form *am as*.

The striking facts that the forms in *-undus* became coincident with those in *-endus*, and that the gerundive-participles in *-andus*, *-endus* of the *a*- and *e*-conjugations, though showing the same time-character as the active participles in *-ns*, still have the idea of necessity, can only be explained by the ever-increasing tendency to a sort of correlation in form and meaning, in the development of the Latin verb system. Hence it was natural that the two forms in *-undus* and *-endus* should come to represent the same idea, when their original meanings—both expressing *actio infecta*, one an action which is being accomplished and the other an action that is to be accomplished—were so closely allied. In this way we can explain the clearly recognizable future idea in the gerundive, as it is allied with or derived from the finite future form. But it must be remembered that the exact process of the combination and the relation between the two forms can only be decided when some agreement has been reached concerning the relation of the forms *legam*, *legas* and *leges*.

This discussion introduces the main question—What meaning and syntactic use has the future passive participle had in Latin? The answer must be sought for in the facts of actual usage, and in Weisweiler's opinion it is that the verbal adjective in *-ndus* is clearly a future pass. participle, that it is the adjectival expression of verbal action as an action related to an affected subject, and to be accomplished. The rest of the book is occupied in showing that the usages adduced as evidence against this statement of the passive meaning of the gerundive-participle do not in fact constitute such evidence; secondly, in explaining the character of the gerundive construction and its relations to the gerundial construction; and lastly, in showing that the idea of 'is to be' ('sollen') inheres in this form as well in its attributive as in its absolute uses. Space does not permit us to follow out all the argument on these points. In regard to the first, it seems that Weisweiler has made out a very strong case in showing that no verb form has preserved a passive meaning more distinctly than the gerundive-participle. Cases where an object is used with the impersonal periphrastic conjugation are ingeniously explained by the analogy of impersonal passives with an accusative and infinitive. The failure to understand that the gerund is the substantive impersonal absolute use of the future passive participle, and the gerundive the adjective personal passive use of the same, accounts, in Weisweiler's opinion, for all the inconsistencies and disagreements in the explanation of the relation of the two. One chapter is devoted to proving that the absolute gerund does not necessitate an original active meaning. It afforded the Romans a means of expressing the simple action of the verb as one to be accomplished. The use of the absolute gerund with an accusative object is explained partly by the nature of the object, which is so often a neuter pronoun, but principally by the close relationship between the gerund and infinitive. This is one of the most unsatisfactory parts of the

work. In his argument to show that there is always a difference between the absolute gerund and the present participle, Weisweiler is more successful. In the last chapter he tries to show that in all cases where this participle is used, there is a distinct reference to future time, more or less vivid, or more exactly to an action to be accomplished, whether this accomplishment actually occurs or not. In this we think he is quite successful, and we quote his last paragraph. "So liegt auch jenen Variationen des 'Sollens' in den verschiedenen Gebrauchsweisen des Verbaladjektivs auf *-ndus* im Lateinischen ein allgemeiner, 'noch unentfalteter Begriff des Müssens' zu Grunde, *der Begriff der zu vollziehenden Thätigkeit*. Nur die Anerkennung dieser Auffassung der Verbalhandlung ermöglicht zugleich die rechte Einsicht in die mannigfaltige *syntaktische Verwendung* jener Verbalform und in der Sinn der Bezeichnungen *gerundium* und *participium futuri passivi*." The book may be pronounced a most interesting and stimulating contribution to the literature of this participle, although we by no means believe that the last word has yet been said on this subject.

SAMUEL BALL PLATNER.

Noctes Manilianae sive dissertationes in Astronomica Manilii. Accedunt, Coniecturae in Germanici Aratea. Scripsit R. ELLIS. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1891. 255 pp.

Robinson Ellis has a remarkable fondness for difficult and neglected authors. In calling attention to Manilius he has added one more to the many services already rendered by him to scholarship. One is almost tempted to paraphrase the title of his latest work by 'the dark passages of Manilius,' for doing which a certain justification might be found in the *Ibis*, v. 63:

Utque mei versus aliquantum noctis habebunt.

Occasional flashes of genius Manilius has, but they do not illumine his whole poem. His muse rarely leaves the earth to soar among the stars, although the stars form his subject. There are a few lines which haunt the memory and which claim a place for themselves beside Lucretius, to whom, however, Manilius is as inferior in poetic fire as he is in sustained enthusiasm. Recent criticism has shown that the last editor, Jacob (1846), erred in attaching supreme importance to Vossianus II, a Leyden MS of the year 1470. A Brussels MS, the Gemblacensis, of the end of the tenth or the beginning of the eleventh century, now claims the first rank, and Ellis, differing from Bechert, shows that the Vossianus II comes next, while the Lipsiensis, Cusanus, and other MSS must occasionally be appealed to, to establish the correct reading. Ellis himself adds many readings from a Bodleian and a Corpus Christi MS, and has collated anew both the Vossiani. In his attempts to restore the text he is for the most part conservative, and, in striking contrast to Bentley, aims to adhere to the ductus litterarum. It would be impossible within the limits of this notice even to glance at the scores of passages on which Ellis has thrown new light, either by a clear recognition of the difficulties in the existent text, a better interpretation, or an improved reading. Much obscurity, of course, remains and will remain, and not all of the arguments advanced carry conviction.